

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES MANALISAY,

Plaintiff,

v.

BOYDINE HALL, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 22-cv-04701-VC

**ORDER REVOKING IN FORMA  
PAUPERIS STATUS ON APPEAL**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 40, 43


The Court finds that revocation of in forma pauperis status is appropriate in this case because Manalisay's appeal is frivolous. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3); *Hooker v. American Airlines*, 302 F.3d 1091, 1092 (9th Cir. 2002).

As explained in the Court's order dismissing the case with prejudice, Manalisay's allegations—regarding constitutional violations by administrative actors associated with his child support proceedings—are nearly impenetrable. *See* Dkt. No. 38. He seems not to recognize the authority of administrative law judges, and he characterizes state court orders regarding his child support obligations as mere “contracts” to which he is not bound for not having assented to them. On that basis, he challenges the actions of Department of Child Support Services agents, who allegedly levied his bank accounts, investment retirement accounts, and COVID-19 stimulus checks pursuant to those court orders, as unlawful seizures under the Fourth Amendment. He also purports to bring a claim for bank fraud against his ex-wife and the mother of his child, Karen Santana, under 18 U.S.C. § 1344, a criminal statute that does not create a private right of action.

The Clerk shall transmit a copy of this order to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: May 19, 2023

---

VINCE CHHABRIA  
United States District Judge